

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05933 251928Z

42

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-08 ISO-00 ACDE-00 USIE-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00

H-01 INR-05 IO-04 L-01 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01

PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01

NSC-05 DODE-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00 SSO-00 EB-04 AECE-00

/072 W

----- 126407

O P 251210Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8404

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 5933 SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 5933

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION OCTOBER 24 ON AIR MANPOWER

REF: A) STATE 229321; B) MBFR VIENNA 339; C) STATE 233739

SUMMARY: SPC ON OCTOBER 24 MADE PROGRESS ON GUIDANCE ON NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AIR MANPOWER, WITH DISCUSSION CENTERING ON U.S. TEXT. UK AND FRG PROPOSED REVISIONS OF U.S. FIRST SENTENCE, CHANGING CONTEXT TO NON-CIRCUMVENTION OF PHASE I REDUCTIONS. UK REVISION APPEARS VERY CLOSE TO REVISION SUGGESTED IN REF C. U.S. REP INFORMED SPC OF U.S. WILLINGNESS TO CONSIDER PRESENTATION TO EAST OF EXTENSION OF NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT AS A NON-CIRCUMVENTION PROVISION, RATHER THAN AS LINKAGE TO PHASE II. SPC WILL NEXT DISCUSS THIS ISSUE ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 28. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE ON UK AND FRG SUGGESTED REVISION
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05933 251928Z

OF U. S. TEXT. END SUMMARY

1. FRG REP (RANTZAU) CIRCULATED FIVE QUESTIONS CONCERNING INCLUSION OF AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT,

WHICH SPC TRANSMITTED TO MBFR WORKING GROUP FOR MILITARY-TECHNICAL ANALYSIS. THESE FIVE QUESTIONS, WHICH WE ARE REPORTING SEPTTEL, LARGELY OVERLAPPED THE FIVE QUESTIONS ALREADY SUBMITTED TO THE WG.

2. TURKISH REP (GUR) INDICATED CONCERN ABOUT INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN MBFR, EVEN IF LIMITED ONLY TO THE PERIOD BETWEEN PHASES. HE WAS CONCERNED THAT THE ALLIES WOULD NOT RESIST EASTERN PRESSURE FOR INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN PHASE II. HE SAW SERIOUS RISKS THAT INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER COULD DAMAGE ALLIED MILITARY CAPABILITY, ADVERSELY EFFECT THE FLANKS AND LEAD TO THE EXPANSION OF AREA COVERED BY MBFR.

3. UK REP (LOGAN) LOOKED FORWARD TO A DISCUSSION OF ALL THE U.S. PROPOSALS ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN THE SPC AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE. HE STRESSED THE UK INTEREST IN PRESENTING ANY LIMIT ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER BETWEEN PHASES AS A NON-CIRCUMVENTION MEASURE CONCERNING GROUND FORCE LIMITATIONS. ONE WAY TO ACHIEVE THIS COULD BE THE REVISION OF THE FIRST SENTENCE IN THE U. S. TEXT TO READ AS FOLLOWS "ALLIED NEGOTIATORS ARE AUTHORIZED TO SUGGEST TO THEIR WARSAW PACT COLLEAGUES THAT THE PROPOSED MUTUAL NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON GROUND FORCE MANPOWER SHOULD, IN ORDER TO AVOID POSSIBLE CIRCUMVENTION, BE EXTENDED TO AIR FORCE MANPOWER." (FYI: REMAINDER OF U.S. TEXT, PER REF A, IS IDENTICAL WITH TEXT IN PARA 11, REF B PLUS THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE "THE AHG SHOULD MAKE CLEAR TO THE EAST, IF NECESSARY, THAT THIS SUGGESTION IN NO WAY IMPLIES CEILINGS ON REDUCTIONS ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN PHASE II.") LOGAN DOUBTED THE NEED FOR THIS LAST SENTENCE IN THE U.S. TEXT WHICH HE THOUGHT COULD UNDERMINE ANY NEGOTIATING BENEFIT THE ALLIES MIGHT GET FROM THE 7. S. APPROACH.

4. U.S. REP (MOORE) ASKED IF THE UK PROPOSAL MEANT THAT THE UK WAS NO LONGER ADVOCATING ITS STEP ONE PROPOSAL (A PROVISION TO PREVENT AIRMEN FROM UNDERTAKING TASKS PRESENTLY PERFORMED BY GROUND FORCES). HE ALSO ASKED IF THE UK PROPOSAL NO LONGER IMPLIED SEPARATE SUB-CEILINGS FOR GROUND AND AIR MANPOWER.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05933 251928Z

LOGAN REPLIED THAT THE UK WAS NOT NECESSARILY DROPPING STEP ONE, AND HAD NOT YET DECIDED ON THE USE OF SEPARATE SUB-CEILINGS, ALTHOUGH THE UK PROPOSAL IMPLIED A SINGLE CEILING.

5. RANTZAU SAID THE FRG BELIEVES THE U.S. TEXT CREATES TOO CLOSE A CONNECTION BETWEEN THE LIMIT ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER AND THE LINK BETWEEN PHASES. FRG PARTICULARLY COULD NOT AGREE TO THE PHRASE IN U.S. TEXT "AIR MANPOWER COULD BE BROUGHT INTO THE NO-INCREASE COMMITMENT". FRG BELIEVED THE ALLIES CAN SIMPLY TELL THE OTHER SIDE THAT WE ARE READY TO DISCUSS AN UNDERSTANDING TO MAKE SURE THAT REDUCTIONS ON U.S. AND SOVIET GROUND FORCES ARE NOT CIRCUMVENTED THROUGH ADDITONS TO AIR FORCE MANPOWER. THEREFORE THE FRG SUGGESTED REVISING

THE FIRST SENTENCE IN THE U.S. TEXT AS FOLLOWS "ALLIED NEGOTIATORS ARE AUTHORIZED TO SUGGEST TO THE EAST THAT IN CONNECTION WITH A SATISFACTORY FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT, AIR MANPOWER COULD BE DEALT WITH IN A WAY WHICH WOULD ASSURE THAT, WHILE NEGOTIATIONS WERE IN PROGRESS, THE LEVEL OF AIR MANPOWER WOULD NOT BE RAISED AND THE FUNCTIONS OF GROUND FORCES WOULD NOT BE TRANSFERRED TO OTHER FORCES."

6. U.S. REP, DRAWING ON REF C, SAID THE U.S. AUTHORITIES HAD STUDIED THE UK REMARKS MADE AT THE PREVIOUS SPC MEETING. HE NOTED THAT PREVIOUS U.S. COMMENTS ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION APPROACH APPLIED TO MORE GENERAL MEASURES. HE WELCOMED THAT THE UK WAS CALLING FOR A LIMIT ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER BETWEEN PHASES. HE SAID THE U.S. AUTHORITIES COULD NOW CONSIDER PRESENTING OUR APPROACH TO THE EAST AS A NON-CIRCUMVENTION PROVISION, RATHER THAN AS LINKAGE TO PHASE II. THIS MEANT THAT THE LIMIT ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER WOULD CONSTITUTE AN ASSURANCE PREVENTING CIRCUMVENTION OF PHASE I REDUCTIONS, RATHER THAN AN ASSURANCE LINKING THE TWO PHASES. HE SAID THAT WASHINGTON WOULD EXAMINE THE PROPOSED UK AND FRG AMENDMENTS TO THE U.S. TEXT. HOWEVER, HE KNEW WASHINGTON WOULD HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THE ENDING OF THE FRG SENTENCE RE SEPARATE CEILING AND RESTRICTION ON GIVING FUNCTIONS OF GROUND FORCES TO AIR FORCES, HE DREW ON THE RATIONALE IN PARA 3, REF C.

7. NETHERLANDS REP (SIZOO) SAID HE WAS STRUCK BY THE GERMAN PHRASE LIMITING THE COMMITMENT TO THE PERIOD "WHILE NEGOTIATIONS
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05933 251928Z

WERE IN PROGRESS." HE THOUGHT THAT UNDERMINED THE UTILITY OF THE GUIDANCE. U.S. REP NOTED THAT THE U.S. WANTED THE COMMITMENT IN THIS PARTICULAR PIECE OF GUIDANCE LIMITED TO THE PERIOD BETWEEN PHASES. HE REITERATED THAT WE HOPED THAT THE AHG COULD USE THIS GUIDANCE AS PART OF A PROBLEM OF EASTERN INTEREST IN, AND WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR, OTHER COMMITMENTS WHICH WOULD BE THE SUBJECT OF SEPARATE GUIDANCE.

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 25 OCT 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO05933
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741091/abbryybl.tel
Line Count: 149
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) STATE 229321; B) MBFR VIENNA 339; C) STATE 233739
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 27 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <27 MAR 2002 by elyme>; APPROVED <23 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION OCTOBER 24 ON AIR MANPOWER
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005